

Copy 2



0 014 078 581 7

"HELL LET LOOSE"

The Story of a Great Wrong!

THE HAVERHILL RIOTS

***A Crime Against American Liberty
and Free Speech.***

LEST WE FORGET!

LET US BELIEVE that the whole of truth can never do harm to the whole of virtue; and remember that in order to get the whole of truth, you must allow every man, right or wrong, freely to utter his conscience, and protect him in so doing. Entire unshackled freedom for every man's life, no matter what his doctrine—the safety of free discussion, no matter how wide its range. The community which dares not protect its humblest and most hated member in free utterance of his opinions, no matter how false or hateful, is only a gang of slaves.—
WENDELL PHILLIPS.

***"Ye shall know the Truth and the Truth shall
make you Free,"***

—Jesus.

***Truth Lives to Bless All, and Break the Shackles
of Fear, Hate and Superstition.***

—Leyden.

THE DANGER AHEAD!

What may be expected in the United States of America
if Hyphenated Americans Get Control.

The Thrilling Story

OF

Lawlessness, Mobocracy and Sectarian Bigotry

AT HAVERHILL, MASS.,

When an American Citizen was mobbed for daring to
speak upon the question---

“Shall Public Funds be Given to Sectarian Schools”

The Speaker, Rev. Thomas E. Leyden,

Preacher, Publisher, Printer was insulted, his life threatened, and
denied the right of Free Speech by the Romish Mob.

Shall the blot on the fair name of the City of Haverhill, stand? Shall
the ailen enemy in our midst be permitted to terrorize and
intimidate true Americans for daring to tell the truth?

READ - - REFLECT - - VOTE

Stand for God and American Liberty.

F74
H216

copy

COPYRIGHT, 1921
EVANGELIST LEYDEN PUBLISHING CO.
SOMERVILLE, MASS.

AUG 20 1921
BY MAIL

6
6
6
6
6
6
6
6
6
6

THE STORY

OF THE

HAVERHILL RIOTS.

On the morning of April 4th, the citizens of Boston, Mass., gazed in amazement on great scare headlines on the first page of every daily paper.

The Post's flaming announcement read as follows:

BIG RIOT RAGES IN HAVERHILL, MANY BEATEN; MILITIA IS OUT.

City Hall Stormed by Angry Mob while Rev. Thomas E. Leyden was hidden in the Aldermanic Chamber.—Resentment at Anti-Catholic Meeting Starts Trouble—Mayor Forbids Meeting, but Crowd Cries for Vengeance—Houses of Citizens Are Stoned.

Windows of Buildings Broken by Stones Thrown by Infuriated Men.

Minister Among Those Who Are Assaulted by the Mad Band of Rioters.

The Boston Globe told the Story in its headlines as follows:

10,000 IN WILD HAVERHILL RIOT.

Militia Called out to Suppress Mob That Gets Beyond Police—Trouble Begins at Leyden Meeting.

City Hall and Police Station Attacked with Missiles Torn from Streets.

National Club is Wrecked and Officer and Civilian Are Brutally Beaten.

The Boston Journal broke the News in this fashion:

MAYOR CALLS OUT MILITIA TO FIGHT HAVERHILL MOB.

Crowd Attacks City Hall, Rings False Fire Alarms and Overpowers Police.

Anti-Catholic Lecture Cause of the Trouble.

Private Residences and Hotels Also Objects of the Crowd's Hostility.

The Herald's heading ran as follows:

TROOPS ARE CALLED OUT FOR HAVERHILL RIOT.

Anti-Catholic Orator Stirs Mob of 8000 to Frenzy.

Dr. Thomas E. Leyden, "The American Luther of the New Reformation," Endeavors to Hold Meeting at City Hall—Hundreds of Panes of Glass Broken—Shots Fired—False Alarms Kept Firemen Dashing About—Police Helpless—Mayor Calls Out Co. F.

In these bold headlines the press of the city, where stands the cradle of liberty, epitomized the latest Roman Catholic outrage in the nation-wide systematic war which Knights of Columbus and other "props of the hierarchy" are waging on the organic law of our land.

It is a fact worthy of notice that this example of criminal lawlessness follows an exactly similar exhibition of Roman Catholic defiance of the constitution, the laws of the state, and the life and limb of the citizens, which occurred in the city of Chicago just one month earlier.

A RECORD OF CRIME.

Here is a partial record of the crimes committed in this lawless orgy by the faithful subjects of the sovereign on the Tiber in their successful effort to trample underfoot the constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech and public assembly, as reported in the Boston and Haverhill papers.

The Rev. Robert Atkinson, pastor of the First Presbyterian church, assaulted in city hall.

Patrolman J. R. Bridgman, cruelly beaten while attempting to arrest one of the criminals.

Charles Jackson, dragged from the National Club and terribly beaten.

Corporal Thomas Payne, wounded by a piece of plate glass thrown by the rioters.

A patriot youth, named Chase, shamefully beaten and another young man who was chased by the mob and overtaken on Fleet street, beaten into almost unconsciousness.

Edward McDonald, murderously assaulted by the mob.

The City Hall Police Station windows smashed, doors broken down and other damage inflicted upon public property.

The National Club room wrecked and furniture thrown to the streets.

A number of halls of patriotic clubs and societies visited, and

wanton destruction inflicted on property. The Academy of Music Building in which the A. O. U. M. hall is located, suffered the greatest damage.

The private homes of certain Protestant and patriotic citizens wantonly attacked, the windows being smashed, and other destruction of property inflicted, while the unprotected women and children in these homes—refined American wives and daughters—were terrorized by this twentieth century exhibition of repetition of Roman Catholic history in the papacy's undying war on liberal government and the just rights of the people.

A NIGHT OF TERROR

During the night, pandemonium reigned in Haverhill, as lawless thousands made the long hours hideous in giving this impressive illustration of the result of "Roman Catholic religious training."

From time to time amid the incessant din, occasioned by the crashing of windows, the breaking down of doors, the ringing of fire alarms, the wrecking of buildings and the criminal assaults upon peaceful citizens and officers of the law, rose the shrill cry, "We want Leyden, we will kill him" "Why don't you give him over to us, we'll take care of him," and other exclamations which proved how well parochial schools had taught these subjects of the pope to hate our constitutional provision for public speech and assembly.

THE STORY OF THE CRIME

Here is an outline story of this latest exhibition of Roman Catholic disloyalty to our constitution.

Rev. Thomas E. Leyden, a protestant minister and a well known patriotic lecturer, was invited to deliver some addresses dealing with the very vital question, "Should the state appropriate public funds for sectarian schools?" This is a question which the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Massachusetts wishes placed on the **Index Prohibitorum**. Neither press nor public speakers must discuss this question from the democratic viewpoint if Rome can prevent it.

Mayor Bartlett, of Haverhill, refused to grant the permit for the use of the city hall for the lecture.

This called forth a strong protest from the Protestant Ministers Association on the ground that it violated the constitutional right of free speech.

The municipal council took up the question, and, after full discussion, gave the necessary permission.

On Sunday, April 2nd, the lecturer appeared to exercise his constitutional rights, fortified by the permission given by the city of Haverhill.

On the platform were Rev. J. Franklin Babb, pastor of the Union Congregational church, and Dr. Herbert E. Wales, the chairman of the day.

Lawlessness was in evidence from almost the start, the singing of "Sweet Adeline," hooting, coughing, shouting became more and more marked until finally the meeting was broken up by the rioters. Even during the prayer by the Congregational clergyman, the Roman hoodlums testified to their respect for God by noisy demonstrations. Dr. Leyden requested the audience to sing America, something which doubtless gave offense to the subjects of the pope as from thence on the determined effort to break up the meeting showed that the rioters present had no fear of the guardians of law and order. Here are a few words taken down during Dr. Leyden's attempt to speak by a reporter for the Boston **Journal**.

Friends, it remains for you this afternoon, who oppose me, to prove whether you believe in American liberty or not. If I am not telling you the truth there is enough law beneath the Stars and Stripes to get justice under it. Because you crush the speaker's voice, you will do no harm to the speaker, but you will do harm to try to crush liberty, in the city hall of Haverhill, this afternoon. It is no one but a coward who would insult a man in the position I am in. If the police of Haverhill do not keep order (noise and shouting drowns voice of speaker) I will appeal to the governor (tumult and disorder).

"If I do not tell you the truth you have recourse to law, but one of our bulwarks is free speech, the right of an American to express his opinion, and when you deny that right (voice of speaker drowned by noise) you are not insulting me, but **Almighty God, and America and the Constitution**.

Soon the noise became so great that only a few words of the speaker, such as "if the police of Haverhill," could be heard by the reporter, above the din. Someone in the audience shouted "**who's your undertaker?**"

An attempt to deliver a prayer was greeted by cries

and hisses, and Dr. Babb was called on to dismiss the meeting. He said, "As an American citizen, I never was so ashamed in my life. I was never so ashamed of a police force. I want to tell you men who have broken up this meeting that you have done more to help Dr. Leyden, than if you had worked for fifty years, (noise and confusion.)"

The meeting was thus broken up by the lawless enemies of free speech. Intolerant Rome had triumphed on the soil of Massachusetts, the sacred right guaranteed by the constitution had been trampled underfoot. The city of Haverhill had been flouted by the enemies of law and order, a stigma had been placed on the name of Massachusetts.

THE GATHERING STORM

The exhibition of shameful inefficiency on the part of the city authorities and the police department emboldened the criminals and they prepared for Monday night, when they proposed to deal a crushing blow to the federal constitution's guarantee of freedom of speech and assembly, and to show just how men who have received Roman Catholic training and education in the parochial schools regard our federal constitution, the laws of the state and the sanctity of the life and the property of those who are brave enough to defend the free democracy of Jefferson and the other great founders of this republic.

In the old days, Rome taught and practiced the shameful teachings that heretics should be despoiled of their property. The Roman Catholic mob of Haverhill who murderously assaulted and brutally beat a number of Protestant citizens, and who attacked the quiet homes of Alderman Hoyt, Dr. Wales and others, crashing windows, destroying property and terrifying almost into hysteria the helpless women and children in the homes, showed in a startling manner, that Rome in America today, has not traveled very far from the Rome of the Inquisition.

MONDAY NIGHT AT CITY HALL

Dr. Leyden is an elderly man, but he has the courage of an old crusader.

He was billed to speak on Monday night, the consti-

tution had guaranteed him the right, and the city of Haverhill had granted him permission.

No one but the subjects of a foreign sovereign, would dare to question that right, **when to question would be to admit disloyalty to the federal constitution and its emblem.**

But there were those who knew how for years Rome has been poisoning the wells of free government in our midst, and foreseeing exactly what did happen, they counseled weak surrender before the lawless traitors to the constitutional guarantees.

Not so, Dr. Leyden, he stood for a freeman's rights. He was loath to believe that the constitution and the flag of free America would be defied and insulted **even by those who owe their allegiance to the foreign sovereign on the Tiber.**

The police, after 150 people had entered the hall, locked the doors.

Dr. Leyden was urged to cancel his lecture, by Alderman Hoyt, but refused. In the meantime a great crowd had assembled in the streets, and a diversion was created inside the hall when a brick crashed through the windows and almost struck Mrs. Grace H. Oatman, a former member of the school committee.

Outside the hall the mob grew more and more menacing. Strident voices and sinister threats rose above the general din. The mob prepared to rush the door; the police threatened to shoot if the attempt was made. The lights in the building flashed on and off; someone was tampering with the switches. The women became panic stricken and fled to a room below. Finally Dr. Leyden appeared, pale but cool and brave. He commenced to speak and instantly the uproar began, jeers, hoots and singing drowned his voice. Rev. Robert Atkinson, who was in the audience, rose to protest and was instantly roughhoused by the mob, who attempted to rush him down the stairs; police rescued him.

Seeing the utter hopelessness of **attempting to cope** with the situation, Dr. Leyden left the platform just as the rioters crashed in a glass door that opened onto one of the fire escapes, and one hundred of Rome's servitors rushed in shrieking, "We want Leyden!" By that time stones and

sticks were raining throughout the building blended with the sinister cry of the rioters and the shouting of the police.

Again Roman Catholics had trampled over the federal constitution and defied the laws of the commonwealth of Massachusetts.

OUTSIDE THE CITY HALL

Outside the hall things went from bad to worse. That this defiance of law and order was no sporadic outbreak was clearly shown by the fact that Haverhill furnished only a part of these lawless rioters. From all directions came these

NIGHT RIDERS FOR THE POPE

Boston, Lawrence, Lowell, Newburyport and Portsmouth, yielded their quotas. Freedom was to receive a crushing blow, so from eight to ten thousand subjects of the sovereign on the Tiber assembled to show America the difference between the papal theory of government and the democracy of our federal constitution.

They succeeded!

The mob of Monday night was not content with forcibly breaking up the meeting and attempting the life of the speaker. It proceeded to wreak its vengeance on public property.

Had not the city of Haverhill dared to permit an American citizen to exercise his constitutional right to criticize Rome and institute a comparison between her parochial schools and the free schools of the republic? For this offense were not the subjects of the pope fully justified in smashing windows, breaking doors and committing other depredations on the city hall and jail? And since they could not find the speaker, to do personal violence to him, they proceeded forthwith to brutally beat and murderously assault a number of law abiding citizens whose only offense was **their loyalty to the constitution of this nation.**

Next, these upholders of the Roman Catholic brand of good citizenship, loyalty and patriotism, proceeded to visit and wreck various patriotic club rooms, then they remembered that Alderman Hoyt, commissioner of public safety, and Dr. Wales had displayed an offensive interest in up-

holding the constitutional right of freedom of speech **which** **will accorded with the theory and practice of the church of the index and the inquisition**, so they proceeded to break all the windows in their homes. Dr. Wales' piazza was wrecked and the windows of his neighbors' houses were smashed in on every hand. Defenseless women and children were frightened into almost hysteria.

NOT LOCAL OR SPORADIC

The Haverhill mob was but one example of a nation-wide campaign of criminal lawlessness and but one phase of a many sided war which the Roman Catholic hierarchy and its props, the Knights of Columbus, the American Federation of Catholic Societies, the Hibernians, the Jesuits and other organizations are waging upon the organic law of our land.

Furthermore, let no one suppose that this papal exhibition of intolerance and hatred of liberty for those who dare to challenge Rome is sporadic, or that the tens of thousands of Knights of Columbus and other props of the hierarchy who participated in the criminal lawlessness were merely the ignorant and unrepresentative members of the Roman Catholic communion.

This was merely one example of exhibitions of intolerance, religious bigotry and hatred of our constitutional guarantees that are constantly finding expression in words and acts of the leaders of political Romanism in all branches of government.

Thus, for example, the Boston **Globe** of March 27, less than ten days before the Haverhill papal riot, published a column's report of an address before the American Federation of Catholic Societies by C. S. Sullivan, of the municipal court of Charlestown, in which "Judge" Sullivan characterized the "Masons, Knights of Pythias and Odd Fellows," as organizations "to be combatted" as "leading into darkness and error." He sneered at the Boy Scouts, declared that Catholics must repel the energies of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, and the Massachusetts Children's Aid Society, because they had dared to oppose the appropriations of public funds for sectarian institutions.

The Guardians of Liberty consisting of almost a million of high minded patriotic citizens under the leadership of Gen. Nelson A. Miles, was cited by this Romanist judge as evidence that bigotry was rampant.

Mayor James M. Curley, of Boston, is on record under his own signature, as declaring that **"the Guardians of Liberty ought not be permitted to exist on American soil,"** while within the last few weeks, Congressman James A. Gallivan, of South Boston, Mass., has introduced into congress a bill which, if passed, would deal a deadly blow through the legislative arm of the national government to the organic law of our land, by an attempt to abridge freedom of religious discussion and freedom of the press. This militant representative of the papal system of government, furthermore, in his pending bill would invest an executive officer with the autocratic power of a Russian bureaucrat, by which he could destroy a great and needed publication without permitting the accused to have the right of the democratic method of trial by jury.

We cite these cases wherein the true spirit of Rome is so luminously shadowed forth by judge, mayor and congressman, as well as by the papal mob, for two reasons: (1) because they show that when we have intolerance and bigotry enthroned on the bench, in executive seats and in the legislative forum of government, it is not strange that it flames forth among the rank and file whose religious prejudices have been nourished in parochial schools and further fed in secret oath bound organizations, (2) because all these instances are found in a single diocese, indeed, the homes of officials and rioters alike are found for the most part within twenty miles of the cardinal's palace in Boston. And what is more, they are strictly typical of the un-American intolerance everywhere in evidence where Rome has felt herself sufficiently strong to exercise the boycott. Without the Roman Catholic boycott that has been so mercilessly employed from ocean to ocean since the hierarchy began its campaign to make America dominantly Roman Catholic, the scores of exhibitions of criminal lawlessness that have disgraced the republic since the Knights of Columbus were organized would never have been possible.

INSULTING MASSACHUSETTS

The daily papers published the statement that Chief Marshall Mack declared that if Dr. Leyden returned to Harvardhill to exercise his constitutional rights he would be arrested for inciting riot. Dr. Leyden does not credit this statement, and let us hope that it was merely what the enemies of our constitution desired him to say, for if Massachusetts has become such a subservient dependency of the sovereign of the Tiber that she will penalize a man for exercising his constitutional rights, and allow those guilty of treason to the constitution, crime against the state and the lives and property of her citizens, to go free, then Massachusetts should cease to ask a place in the sisterhood of states that profess to uphold the organic law of the Nation.

BOSTON EDITORIAL COMMENTS

The Boston press, though treating the riot as its importance required in the news columns, made for the most part no adequate editorial protest against these thousands of Roman Catholics who had added to their disloyalty to our constitution, murderous assaults upon life and the wanton destruction of property. There were three notable exceptions, that of the Boston **Daily Herald**, **Evening Transcript** and **The Christian Science Daily Monitor**; the last named paper published more than a double column article which was very able, dispassionate and sound from the standpoint of democracy, law and order. The **Herald** in an editorial, after pointing out that the fundamental right of free speech can not be safely abandoned, said:

"If the intruding visitor was a weak man, with no message deserving of intelligent consideration, he would have done small harm, surely not enough to justify anybody in resorting to violence. If on the other hand he had something important to say, it should have been met in the free form of argument, and not in a window glass contest. Whichever way the speaker be regarded, therefore, his treatment was unjust and un-American moreover it was a little odd to undertake a riot in advance of the offending speaker's saying anything, offensive or otherwise."

The Boston **Transcript**, probably the ablest evening paper in America, and one of the most important dailies from a literary viewpoint in the New World, published an

editorial that had all the true ring of the Boston of the older day, the Boston of vision, of broad culture and fundamental democratic idealism. This editorial, entitled "A Disgrace to Massachusetts," so clearly and luminously states the case for democracy, that we give it below in full.

We are not much accustomed to lynch law in Massachusetts. The outbreak at Haverhill is therefore as surprising as it is disgraceful. Thomas E. Leyden, the man whom 10,000 rioters apparently sought to lynch, had license to speak in the Haverhill city hall. He had therefore as much right to express his sentiments there as Governor McCall had to address the legislature, or Bishop Lawrence or Cardinal O'Connell to speak to congregations in their respective cathedrals. Standing on his platform there, Leyden is entitled to the protection of the whole power of the commonwealth of Massachusetts, and if that does not suffice, of the United States of America. What he is going to say cuts no figure. He speaks on his responsibility, and may and should be held to a rigid accountability for any libelous, scurrilous or seditious words that he may utter. But his right to speak and to utter his opinions is absolutely sacred. In this state, which was founded upon the principle of freedom of opinion and worship, no more insolent outrage can be offered to the law than to question that right.

Evidently the rioters at Haverhill were bent upon wreaking personal injury, possibly murder, upon the man who intended to speak at the city hall. They did attack innocent men, and they attacked the houses and smashed the windows of ministers who were in sympathy with Mr. Leyden. If this sort of violence is not repressed and properly punished, the lawless insolence that it represents will grow, and we shall have an end of the rights and liberties to establish which, our fathers came into the wilderness.

THE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE

Let no man cloud the issue, it is first and last political and is vital alike to the individual and the state.

We war on no man's religion; on that subject our only concern is to preserve religious freedom.

Our battle is, first, last and all the time merely to preserve the liberal democracy of Jefferson and the other founders and masterbuilders of this republic against all forms of encroachment and the insidious wiles of old world despotisms which antagonize democracy, whether under the cloak of monarchy, bureaucracy, autocracy or hierarchy.

We repeat, we war on no man's religion until it wars on our free democratic government and the constitution of the United States.

The issue is just here. There is in the United States today, two antagonistic **theories of government** at war with each other. They are as opposite as light and darkness. On the one hand we have our free democracy whose distinguishing glories are:

- (1) Popular sovereignty without any recognition of an overlordship on the part of church or hierarchy.
- (2) Freedom of speech, press and assembly.
- (3) Freedom of religious, political, social and economic discussions.
- (4) Absolute divorce between church and state.
- (5) No special favors or privileges to any church, and no public funds for sectarian institutions.
- (6) Popular non-sectarian education.

Opposed to this splendid free democratic system which promotes intellectual hospitality and discourages bigotry, intolerance and dogmatic or creedal antagonisms, we have the papal system of government, which:

- (1) Condemns popular sovereignty that does not recognize the church. (See **ex cathedra** utterances of Leo XIII and Pius X, the last two popes.)
- (2) Demands union of church and state wherever and whenever Catholics become dominant.
- (3) Condemns freedom of research, speech, press and assembly, such as is fostered by our free democracy.
- (4) Condemns the recognition of equal rights for all churches.
- (5) Demands public funds for Roman Catholic institutions.
- (6) Condemns non-sectarian education in Protestant lands, and demands that education shall be in the hands of the Roman Catholic church in Catholic lands.

The papal system of government as outlined above is resolutely set forth in the **ex cathedra** utterances of the last three popes, and is being militantly pressed against our free democratic system by the representatives of the hierarchy in America today.

- (1) In the war on our public schools.
- (2) In the lawless mobocracy and war on freedom of assembly and speech throughout the country.
- (3) In attempted legislation in congress, to abridge freedom of press and to substitute bureaucracy for trial by jury.
- (4) In efforts to secure public funds for sectarian institutions.
- (5) In the nation-wide Roman Catholic un-American boycott.

Here we are in the presence of a war being waged aggressively against the free democracy of this country by

those who are proving that they yield their first allegiance to the rival sovereignty and its system of rule.

Here is the issue. Here must the battle be fought. It is a war between the free democracy and the noble liberalism of the Protestant Reformation and the democratic era on the one hand, and the autocratic antagonistic claims of the papal sovereignty on the other.

SOME IMPORTANT QUESTIONS

The papers declared that the police were powerless to control "the fury of the enraged thousands." Now who stimulated that fury? Not Dr. Leyden who had not been permitted to speak, yet someone fostered it.

Ten thousand men do not go from various cities and towns and exhibit a wild and lawless fury that would put to shame the howling dervishes of the desert, without some one carefully nourished it.

The rioters were ardent Roman Catholics. When Mayor Bartlett addressed them, some one in the crowd shouted, "three cheers for the Catholics of Haverhill!" and they were given in thunderous tones.

Why has not the machinery of justice been set in motion to find out who were the arch conspirators responsible for this shameful exhibition of mobocracy which vividly calls to mind the anarchist riots of Chicago some years ago?

Then the government was swift footed in its search for the responsible principals.

These questions suggest still others. Let us suppose that instead of Knights of Columbus and other subjects of the pope, these criminals who trampled upon the constitution of the United States, who defied the laws of the commonwealth of Massachusetts and without the shadow of an excuse, wantonly destroyed public and private property, while criminally assaulting peaceable citizens, had been Socialists, or anarchists, would the government have made no effort to bring the criminals to the bar of justice?

Few citizens of Massachusetts have forgotten the hysteria of the press and the clamor of Roman Catholic speakers and papers for swift and heavy punishment for the

alleged rioters in the Lawrence Mill outbreak. At that time it was claimed that the Socialists had not shown a proper respect for the flag, and Catholic orators and editors seized upon the alleged disrespectful remarks as excuse for attacks on socialism as wanting in loyalty and patriotism. The leaders were promptly arrested and imprisoned, but here we find defiance of the constitution and state laws, and crimes committed against persons and property, and **no serious attempt on the part of the commonwealth to bring the leaders to the bar of justice** and administer to them the swift punishment that must be impartially administered to all law breakers if justice is to be maintained, the laws respected and the constitution upheld.

The city of Haverhill, the birthplace and childhood home of John Greenleaf Whittier, America's poet of freedom and apostle of the democratic principle of intellectual hospitality—Haverhill, on the banks of the picturesque Merrimac, like Amesbury, is almost a shrine for lovers of freedom and believers in justice and the rights of men, or the democratic system of government, much as Concord, the home of Emerson, is a shrine to the lovers of the larger freedom. Henceforth, however, Haverhill will have an evil distinction in the annals of our republic, henceforth the birth town of the poet of freedom will bear an indelible stain, for here the constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech and assembly was trampled underfoot, by a lawless mob, who imagine that they will hasten the day when America will become dominantly Roman Catholic **if they can forcibly suppress freedom of religious discussion.**

WHAT SHALL BE DONE?

Let every patriot forget all jealousies, all personalities, prejudices and rivalries. Let everyone unite against the aggressive enemy of fundamental democracy. The cause is above all else—all persons and all organizations. The danger is far graver than you imagine; the hope lies in union, consecration to duty, enthusiasm and lofty patriotism.

Here are some further lines by Whittier which sound as though they were written for this very hour, when Rome has placed so deep a stain on the city of his birth

and the commonwealth he so loved, in her relentless war
on the noble freedom to which he consecrated his richest
gifts.

Up the hillside, down the glen
Rouse the sleeping citizen;
Summon out the might of men!

Like a lion growling low,—
Like a night-storm rising slow,—
Like the tread of unseen foe,—

It is coming,—it is nigh!
Stand your homes and altars by;
On your own free thresholds die.

Clang the bells in your spires;
On the gray hills of your sires
Fling to Heaven your signal-fires.

From Washuset, lone and bleak
Unto Berkshire's tallest peak,
Let the flame-tongued heralds speak.

O, for God and duty stand,
Heart to heart and hand to hand,
Round the old graves of the land.

Whoso shrinks or falters now,
Whoso to the yoke would bow,
Brand the craven on his brow!

ROME AND DEMOCRACY IN BOLD CONTRAST.

How the Haverhill Mob Vindicated the Past and Present
Spirit of the Papacy.

Significance of the Burning in Effigy of Free Speech.

Protestant Democracy Replies to Rome---An Appeal to
True American Patriots.

In the preceding chapter we gave the story of the papal riot in Haverhill, Mass., illustrating so boldly and convincingly the dominating spirit of the Roman church in her age-long ceaseless war on freedom of religious discussion. It was an impressive object lesson, showing far more eloquently than words the result of parochial school education, Roman Catholic training and the evil influence of secret oath-bound societies which are seeking to substitute the papal system of government for the broad, tolerant and noble freedom of our Protestant democracy.

It was a typical, and not an exceptional illustration, being merely one of scores of exhibitions of Roman Catholic religious prejudice, intolerance and hatred of our federal constitution that have marked the successive steps in Rome's campaign to make America dominantly Roman Catholic.

These exhibitions of criminal lawlessness have become so alarmingly frequent since the organization of the Knights of Columbus, that unless promptly checked, we shall soon have a nation-wide scandal not unlike the reign of terror and defiance of the constitution and state laws which marked the tragic days when that other oath-bound

secret body, the Molly Maguires, placed an indelible stain upon the escutcheon of Pennsylvania.

In this chapter we wish to show how in bold and pleasing contrast, American Protestant democracy answers intolerant Rome. But before doing this we wish to revert to one incident of the papal riot.

On that wild night in April when Haverhill was taken over by the Knights of Columbus and other "props of the papal hierarchy," the mob, not content with trampling the constitution underfoot, destroying municipal property, wrecking homes of Protestants and making criminal assaults on law abiding citizens, in retaliation for not being permitted to lynch Dr. Leyden, these true sons of the church of the Inquisition committed an act supremely interesting to psychologists, as showing how unerringly a mob reflects the dominant spirit of the institution it represents.

PSYCHOLOGY OF THE ROMISH MOB

To the students of history and psychology, alike, few things are more suggestively instructive than the action of a mob as reflecting the master thought of the power behind it.

Here reason, policy and all hypocritical pretense are thrown to the winds and amid the storm of primal passion is seen in naked sincerity, the dominant thought of the composite mass in action. Here if anywhere is to be found the real spirit of the organization or inspiring body to which these units give allegiance.

Hence, how significant to the student of history, how sinister to the friends of free democracy, and yet how natural, we might say how inevitable, was the intolerance and hatred of our constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and assembly evinced by that mob of knights of the hierarchy.

Its first idea was to defy the constitution and the municipality of Haverhill by preventing freedom of speech and assembly. Next it sought to lynch the man who dared to criticize Rome and show how, while our public schools made for tolerance and hospitality, the parochial schools and Roman Catholic training made for intolerance, bigotry and lawless opposition to our constitution.

Failing in the attempt to lynch Dr. Leyden, the mob further exhibited its hatred of the fundamental law of the nation and state, and its contempt for the municipality of Haverhill, by destroying public and private property and criminally assaulting Protestant citizens.

But one thing remained to be done to give the finishing touch to this picture.

One instinctive act on the part of the mob that would epitomize the true spirit of this Old World power that is warring on our democracy, and this finishing touch was not wanting, as will be seen from the following words of an eye witness as reported in the Haverhill **Gazette** of April 4th.

"An effigy at one o'clock was strung up on the telephone wires and burned. A placard on the effigy read '**Free Speech.**' Shouts from the crowd, '**Down with free speech**' were heard frequently.

With what startling fidelity did this mob instinctively reflect the spirit of the papacy throughout the vanished centuries, nay more, with what vivid realism did it here give emphasis to that notable yet characteristic exhibition of intolerance which leaped from the lips of Benedict XV, on November 21, 1915, when, according to the authorized Rome correspondent of the Boston **Pilot**, Cardinal O'Connell's official organ, the present pope described the distinguished American scholars and God fearing ministers who are representing the Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist and Lutheran churches and schools in Rome as "**Emissaries of Satan and thieves who with full hands scatter broadcast lies and calumnies.**"

This characterization is taken from the verbatim report of Pope Benedict's words as given by this authorized correspondent of the **Pilot**, written from Rome under date of November 27, and published in the **Pilot** of December 25, 1915.

The effigy of free speech in flames and the howling mob like dancing dervishes shouting "**down with free speech,**" was not only in harmony with the intolerance which Pope Benedict voiced last November, not only an eloquent exhibition of the Roman Catholic brand of loyalty to our flag and constitution, but it was also a perfect echo of the voice of Rome, sounding down the ages.

As we read the newspaper story of this twentieth century instinctive voicing of the papacy of yesterday and to-

day, another scene of **Rome in action** rose like a stately but tragic dream before us.

We were standing again in the presence of papal thought in action, not now, however, a conglomerate mass of knights and other "props of the hierarchy" **in lawless rioting**, no, we were in the presence of a general council of the church of Rome, the Council of Constance.

The pope and emperor had given solemn guarantee of safe conduct to and from the council, to John Huss, one of the most illustrious professors of the University of Prague, and one of the purest and most lofty Christian thinkers known to the ages. He had been summoned to answer the charge of heresy. On arriving at the council, he was arrested as a felon, condemned and burned to death. His noble and inspiring books were also given to the flames.

Here we behold the Roman Catholic church in supreme council, adding the crime of perfidy to her age-long, unchanging, implacable hatred of liberty of thought, conscience, speech and press.

Truly Rome never changes. **The same hatred of full-orbed freedom**, which marked the Council of Constance, of the so-called infallible church in the year 1415, is seen in America in the birth-town of the poet of freedom, **blossoming and bearing the same Dead Sea fruit of intolerance, religious bigotry and hatred of freedom of thought and speech**, as was in evidence in the elder day and as has ever been in evidence when the Church of Rome has dared to show her undying opposition to liberty of speech and press.

IS HAVERHILL SORRY?

We are told that Haverhill is sorry. Certain it is that the Protestant ministry has taken a firm and truly democratic stand in favor of removing, as far as may be, the stain from the fair name of the city Rome has so disgraced. But it is equally true that the executive authorities of Haverhill have failed to take the only step that can exonerate the city and measurably lift the stigma which Rome has placed upon her. **So far the city officers have failed to invite the lecturer to return under safe conduct or adequate protection.**

On the disgrace of Haverhill, the Boston **Transcript** follows its fine editorial quoted in **The Menace** last week, by the publication of the following timely utterance.

"Haverhill is sorry," we are told, for the disgrace that it put upon the Commonwealth in its riot of Sunday. It ought to be sorry, and none the less so because the man whom it rioted against, and probably would have lynched if it had got its hands upon him, cannot stand to his guns. As the matter rests now, the mob has won against free speech, which could hardly be vindicated unless the original plan for the meeting at the Haverhill City Hall were carried out. It is a little hard to believe that the principle of free speech has come to that pass in Massachusetts—especially in the near neighborhood of the birthplace of the man who said, "I will not equivocate, I will not excuse, I will not retreat a single inch, and I will be heard." The suppression of Leyden's appearance was as much a manifestation of lawlessness as the mobbing of Garrison in the streets of Boston on Oct. 21, 1835, and deserves the same rebuke that American history has put upon that outrage.

PROTESTANT MINISTERS SPEAK

The entire body of the Protestant clergy of Haverhill, thirteen in number, appeared before Mayor Bartlett and Commissioner Hoyt, on April 7, to protest against the outrage, the inefficiency of the police and the equally disgraceful failure of the department of justice to ferret out, arrest and punish the ring leaders of the mob.

The Rev. Nicholas Van der Pyl acted as spokesman for the ministerial body. In the course of his address he thus voiced the sentiments of the united Protestant ministry of Haverhill:

"I speak in behalf and by the authority of the entire Protestant clergy of the city of Haverhill.

"We deplore, and we feel indignant about the lawlessness which overran this city last Monday night. Our city has been disgraced before the country, and only the people of this city can remove the disgrace which is ours today.

"We are not bigots. We have the highest charity for all who worship God in their own way and according to the dictates of their own conscience.

"But we are also American citizens, and we are the accredited representatives of the morals and religious interests of this city. We hold inviolable the great principles of freedom of speech and freedom of the press, subject to the laws of libel and incendiarism, after the fact, which have been established by all the people, and which only the people can abrogate.

"A mob has overrun our city. Churches have been broken into and desecrated by that mob. The homes of unoffending and innocent citizens have been stoned. In some cases lives have been threatened and placed in jeopardy. We cannot forget so long as the mob is permitted to be victorious, and its leaders glowing in the fact that they have trampled under their feet the most sacred rights of all our people. We will not forget until the principle of free speech has been impressively vindicated by the law-abiding element of this community itself."

The attitude of the mayor, though not surprising in view of his former action, was most discouraging to friends of American democracy and the upholders of the vital rights of free citizens.

The mayor does not wish Dr. Leyden to visit Haverhill at the present time and thus lacerate the sensitive feelings of these criminal upholders of the papal system who have defied the constitution, insulted the state and city and committed crimes against property and person.

From his action it would seem that he thinks it more important to consider the wishes of the leaders of the mob, than to uphold the majesty and dignity of the commonwealth of Massachusetts in the only way that it can be upheld, **by promptly righting the wrong**, for surely he does not believe that the departments of justice and law enforcement of Haverhill and Massachusetts are unable to protect a citizen in the exercise of his constitutional rights. To delay action is to bow to the mob. To place criminal lawlessness before the majesty of law and order, is to admit that these criminals are more powerful than the municipal and state government of Massachusetts. Is such a position satisfactory to the citizens of Haverhill, and the voters of the state of Massachusetts? This is a question that must be faced, for it is fundamental in character and affects alike the integrity of free institutions, the honor of the state and the rights of every citizen.

Is Haverhill to yield to executives who place the wishes of criminal upholders of papal hatred of free speech before the stern demands of outraged law and order to maintain at all hazards the fundamental rights of every free citizen as guaranteed by our federal constitution and the law of the state? Are the rioters, or the federal constitution to receive first consideration?

That is the issue!

If the majesty of the law is to be vindicated no time

should be lost in arranging for Dr. Leyden to return to Haverhill.

In justice to Governor McCall, be it said that he is reported to have stated that he is ready to do his part in protecting Dr. Leyden and the Protestant people of Haverhill who desire to hear him, from those who would flout the laws of Massachusetts and the constitution of the United States.

RESOLUTIONS OF BAPTIST MINISTRY

The Protestant clergy of greater Boston have registered their protest against the outrage in no uncertain tones. Perhaps the most notable of these were the resolutions adopted by the Baptist ministers of greater Boston on April 10th. They were read by Professor F. L. Anderson of Newton Theological Seminary and were, in part, as follows:

"The plain, significant and undisputed fact is that an American citizen was denied the right of free speech, guaranteed by the constitution of Massachusetts, and that the authorities failed to protect him. That the mob was the result of a premeditated plan appears clear from the fact that the lecturer was not permitted even to begin.

"We want to know whether this sort of thing is to continue, whether it is possible that we are entering upon an era of Catholic tyranny in this state, whether henceforth in this state criticism of one church, and only one, is to be indulged in only at the risk of life and limb. We demand of the cardinal that he publicly state his attitude and enforce his authority in such a manner as shall make Catholic mobs impossible in this state. If the cardinal fails to accede to our demand, we shall know how to interpret his continued silence and shall act accordingly.

"We demand that the public authorities bring to justice the leaders of the mob and that the courts impose suitable punishment. A failure here will prove the constitution and laws of Massachusetts mere scraps of paper, and will forever debar our state, the nursery of liberty, from criticising those Commonwealths where lynching goes unavenged. We say this advisedly, for, according to the beliefs of both our fathers and ourselves, liberty of speech is more precious than life.

"But more than this is required. The only adequate reparation which can be made for this public outrage is a public atonement. This, to our mind, should take the form of an arrangement with Mr. Leyden by the citizens of Haverhill, by which he shall speak in Haverhill on the topic already advertised, and shall be protected in his rights by the city and state at any cost. If he then transgresses the laws against slander or incendiary speech, let him be proceeded against by due process of law."

GOV. McCALL ON THE ISSUE

Governor McCall addressing the Methodist ministers on April 10th, said:

"We must keep free and open forums of truth where truth will be analyzed from all points of view.

"A man can adopt the religion which he chooses and no church or state has any right to interfere. There should always be separation of church and state. The basic principles of government cannot exist upon any such union."

The most significant and encouraging event that has followed the papal riot, has been the breaking of the conspiracy of silence which Rome has been able to impose on the Massachusetts press in recent years in regard to religio-politico questions that the hierarchy did not wish discussed.

The Boston **Journal** has, for the time being, opened its columns to a more or less extended discussion of the religious question, and thus this democracy paralyzing silence—the Roman boycott against freedom of politico religious discussion in the press—has been broken. If the true Americans of Massachusetts act with wisdom and unity this advantage can be followed up and the old vital freedom of the press reestablished.

EARNEST APPEAL TO PATRIOTS

To the patriots of Massachusetts the present is big with possibilities, a crisis has been reached which calls upon every man and woman of the commonwealth to join in redeeming the state from papal vassalage, and making old Massachusetts once again the apostle of democracy and the invincible champion of freedom.

The hands on the dial mark another of those mighty struggles with Old World reaction, despotism and intolerance which from time to time register crucial hours in freedom's ceaseless battle for the larger life and nobler idealism.

Duty again summons every child of democracy to join the colors and display anew the lofty patriotism and high consecration to freedom that marked the lives of Adams,

Otis, Hancock, Warren and the intrepid sons of liberty, which in the elder day rendered possible, if not inevitable, the birth of democracy, and that miracle of the eighteenth century, the victory of thirteen poor, little, weak, struggling colonies over the richest and most powerful nation of the earth.

The opportunity which comes to noble souls but once in a life time is knocking at the door of the children of the old Bay State today.

Be great! oh sons and daughters of Massachusetts! Rise to the highest traditions of the grand old commonwealth. Forget all thought of self, all petty jealousies and rivalries. Let the spirit of Samuel Adams, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin enter your souls, then you will become noble enough **to consecrate life and all life holds dearest, to the cause of liberty**, and for the preservation of that fundamental democracy whose very existence is threatened by the powerful, perfectly organized and financed Roman Catholic political machine.

Never since the birth of this nation have free institutions been in deadlier peril than today, when with a gagged press and a nation-wide Roman Catholic boycott, the subjects of the pope are boldly attacking freedom of speech and assembly, freedom of religious discussion, freedom of press, our splendid non-sectarian free schools and the principles of strict divorce of church and state.

Rome has been organized and in politics for years. She is today intrenched and ramified throughout all departments of government. And in and out of government, through her Knights of Columbus, her American federated societies, her Jesuits, as well as the hierarchy as a whole, she is battling against the fundamental principles of our federal constitution, and the great bulwarks of free institutions.

This united war on democracy must be met by united American opposition!

The hour for federated action has arrived. The success where it has been put in force has surpassed all expectations. The duty, the unescapable duty, is clear. The political government of America must be rescued from the papal machine in order that the federal constitution be upheld

and respected, law, order and efficient government maintained, the public school system preserved and the assault on the principle of divorce of church and state by efforts to secure public funds for sectarian purposes sternly resisted.

Never was an occasion more fateful than the present, let this "union for victory" come as the effective reply of aroused patriotism to the papal outrage at Haverhill.

Editorial from the Christian Science Journal, Boston, April 21, 1916.

MOB LAW.

The question of free speech is one of such fundamental importance to humanity that it is easy to understand the commotion which has been caused, in the State of Massachusetts, by the recent riots in Haverhill. The contention that a mob with or without cause, is at liberty to usurp the prerogatives of the courts, and to substitute lynch law for official justice, constitutes, indeed, a precedent destructive of all popular liberty. The history of liberty is very largely the effort of authority to restrain license. When the human passions are roused license is always apt to come to the top. The decision of the mob is the most uncertain of all unknown quantities, and if it is bowed to for a moment there is no limit to which its violence may not spread. Its temper was summed up admirably two centuries ago, by William of Orange, in the historic phrase, "Hosanna! today. Crucify him! tomorrow." No man knew better than William the power of the mob. He had seen it, when he was stadtholder, on that awful day when the citizens of The Hague foully murdered De Witt. That is the way of mobs, from the mob that tore Hypatia in pieces, on the sands of Alexandria, down to the mob which Jack Cade directed, seated upon London Stone, outside the gates of La Force, on the hideous September day, when the prison made its jail delivery to L'Abbaye.

There is no rhyme or reason in the attack of a mob. It is just as willing to smash a great invention like the spinning-jenny, for fear of the displacement of labor, as it is to stuff the mouth of a Foulon with straw. It is just this that makes the case of the mob in Haverhill so important. If its action is overlooked, if it is connived at, worse still if it is justified today, there is no length to which it may not go tomorrow, and the example set, in Haverhill, may be repeated elsewhere at the expense of the very views which the Haverhill exhibition was intended to support. The mob is no logician, subtlety is unknown

to it. It argues with an almost brutal frankness that what it is legitimate for it to do one day must surely be legitimate for it to do on the next day, and it cannot be expected to decide the niceties which will enable casuistry to condone or disown it at pleasure. Nor can the story of its actions be confined to one spot. The story of the action of the Haverhill mob has already gone round the world for all sorts and conditions of men to draw their conclusions from. Those of them who sympathize with the Haverhill rioters may be inclined to follow in the steps of the Haverhill rioters, those who do not sympathize with the Haverhill rioters may be inclined to deal in the argument of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, and there is never any lack of opportunity.

It is just this which makes the defense of the Haverhill mob, which has been set up, so peculiarly unfortunate and inept. To argue that the mob was justified, inasmuch as it was acting within its rights "in making a demonstration, over the heads and against the officials at Haverhill, who violated their lawful authority," is to make the mob the judge of the legality of the situation created by the Haverhill officials. In plain English the extraordinary doctrine is deliberately set forth, that any mob which conceives an act of a public body to be a violation of lawful authority is justified in taking the law into its own hands, and enforcing its own opinions by violence. Such a defense of the Haverhill mob, such a theory of law and order, such a definition of popular rights is surely the most untenable that has ever been put forth. It substitutes for the autocracy of an individual the autocracy of the mob, it even makes the passion of the ringleader the deciding factor over public law and order and public liberty. It places the powers of a Caesar, who is at least supposed to be trained in judicial restraint, in the hands of an ignorant and violent body of irresponsible people whose passions are as inflammable as the highest known explosive.

Worse than this, the defense begs the question, for it starts on the unproved assumption that the officials of Haverhill violated their authority in authorizing Mr. Leyden's meeting. There is not a particle of evidence that this is the case. Mr. Leyden may be an intemperate speaker, whose utterances are calculated to produce a riot. Thous-

ands of other speakers are going about the world with every intention of rousing to the nth the passions of those to whom they speak. But it is commonly held that the law is strong enough to deal with such people. The argument that for twenty years Mr. Leyden has been indulging in such a course is an argument fashioned like the veriest boomerang. Because if the state authorities have been permitting Mr. Leyden to do this for twenty years, and if for twenty years he has been doing it without any very disastrous result, it is the completest object lesson imaginable of the advantage of leaving him alone, and of the utter absence of any necessity for the recent interference of the mob. If there is one thing which over-emphasis on the platform can be trusted to do it is to frustrate its own ends. Twenty years of over-emphasis should have long ago reduced Mr. Leyden to a negligible quantity. If, on the other hand, Mr. Leyden has something to say which he is entitled to say and justified in saying in public, and that is the only interpretation to be placed on the action of the state in permitting him to exercise this right for twenty years, then the action of the Haverhill officials was perfectly justified in permitting him the use of the hall, and he himself was exercising a right which is his as a citizen of the country, and a repudiation of which, by the officials in Haverhill, would be tantamount to a repudiation of the right of freedom of speech.

But, says the gentleman who has issued this extraordinary defense, a defense which really deserves the widest publicity, "the policy of the Commonwealth and of all good citizens is to prevent unlawful conduct." Is it to be maintained for one moment that it is lawful for a mob to break up a meeting which has been authorized by the officials of the town in which it is held? Mr. Leyden's meeting having been authorized, the fault, if there was a fault, was with the officials and not with him, and were his methods ever so much to be deprecated, and were the actions of the officials of Haverhill ever so wrong, either legally or morally, can mob violence as an antidote to this be seriously held up as a panacea for unlawful conduct? The fact is that the laws of the state were at the disposal of the mob or their leaders for preventing Mr. Leyden from speaking, and for preventing the officials from authorizing the use of

the hall, if there was anything illegal in the conduct of either. If no resort was made to any legal process, it can only be concluded the failure was founded on the fact that Mr. Leyden and the Haverhill officials were pursuing a course as legal as the course which has been followed, in other parts of the state, during the twenty years which have been specified.

The simple fact is that the Haverhill mob outraged in the frankest and most indefensible way the common right of free speech. It is not of the slightest importance who Mr. Leyden was, what he was going to say, or what the effect of his words might be. He was entitled to speak, or he was not entitled to speak. If he was entitled to speak no mob had any right to prevent him. If he was not entitled to speak, no mob had any right to decide the question and to enforce its own decision. In each event it outraged entirely the rights of free speech, the only difference is that in one case it outraged it rather worse than in the other.

• Extracts from an Editorial in the Haverhill Evening Gazette, April 4, 1916.

The senseless plague of racial hate has had its fling and run-amuck. Between two suns mob rule and destruction have stalked in the shadow of the seat of government; highways devoted to the peaceful pursuits of trade have become the promenade of a mad mob; quiet and peaceful home sections of this old Puritan community that have been undisturbed since the days of war have served for the bedlam of frenzied rioters, and civic control has given way to the rule of the guardsman's bayonet.

All comprehension of intelligent citizenship and community patriotism was lost in the immeasurable misfortune marking the atrocious performances of the mob. Hundreds of people went insane as truly as any individual ever did. The wave of hysteria found expression in crimes against all law until it reached the level of the guardsman's gun and then broke to pieces with a crash that was felt at day-dawn in every community of the republic.

The Gazette apologizes to the rest of the country for the men who have shamed Haverhill. The personal assaults and wanton destruction of public and private property and the disturbance of the public peace were infamous crimes that demand the immediate attention of a grand jury probe.

This is no time for vain regrets. The unpardonable blunder of the government is history now; the costly error made by the aldermen is on the official records to stay. But the momentary rule of

anarchy, contemptible and lamentable as it may seem at this hour, will have served a splendid purpose if it shall have closed forever the base mouths that cast their poisoned saliva of creed contentions on the face of the community.

The government has paid the price of its folly. Perhaps the future will show that the experience was worth the price in propounding the civic strength to take such measures and select such men for public service as will forever make impossible the reenactment of a scene of beast-life that stains the cheek of a civilized and Christian community with shame.

AMERICA

My country 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing.
Land where my fathers died!
Land of the Pilgrim's pride!
From every mountain side
Let freedom ring.

Our Father's God to Thee,
Author of Liberty,
To Thee we sing.
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us by Thy might,
Great God, our King!

Let music swell the breeze,
And ring from all the trees
Sweet freedom's song!
Let mortal tongues awake,
Let all that breathe partake,
Let rocks their silence break—
The sound prolong.

My native country! thee,
Land of the noble free,
Thy name I love.
I love thy rocks and rills,
Thy woods and templed hills:
My heart with rapture thrills
Like that above.



0 014 078 581 7

LEST WE FORGET

By JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER

Born in Haverhill, Mass., December 17, 1807

Lift again the stately emblem on Bay State's
rusted shield,
Give to Northern winds the Pine-Tree on our
banner's tattered field.
Sons of men who sat in council with their Bibles
round the board,
Answering England's royal missive with a firm
"Thus saith the Lord!"
Rise again for home and freedom!—set the
battle in array!—
What the fathers did of old time we their sons
must do today.

O my God!—for that free spirit, which of old in
Boston town
Smote the Province House with terror, struck
the crest of Andros down!—
For another strong-voiced Adams in the city's
street to cry,
"Up for God and Massachusetts!—Set your feet
on Mammons lie!"

* * * * *

Where's the Man for Massachusetts!—Where's the
voice to speak her free?—
Where's the hand to light up bonfires from her
mountains to the sea?
Beats her Pilgrim pulse no longer?—Sits she
dumb in her despair?—
Has she none to break the silence?—Has she
none to do and dare!
O my God! for one right worthy to lift up
her rusted shield,
And to plant again the Pine-Tree in her banner's
tattered field!

This booklet published by request of the People, compiled from Press Reports, extracts, etc., tells the story of a great wrong that has not been righted.—The publisher still lives to "Cry aloud and spare not."—Isa., 58-1.

ADDRESS ALL ORDERS TO EVANGELIST LEYDEN PUB. CO.,
41 BRASTOW AVENUE, SOMERVILLE, MASS.
PRICE 25c. FIVE COPIES \$1.00



0 014 078 581 7